DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 322 126 SP 032 517

AUTHOR Moore, Barbara McGregor
TITLE First Year Teachers and the Evaluation Process.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teacher Induction; *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Job Satisfaction; *Mentors; Program Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Evaluation; Teaching Experience

ABSTRACT

Two different school districts' induction and evaluation methods were investigated to discover what specific methods help beginning teachers to learn more about teaching and how what they learn influences satisfaction with their work. One district had an induction program which used experienced teachers as full-time consultants to provide assistance and evaluations for the first-year teachers. The second district provided an informal and voluntary program of assistance using mentor-buddies at the same school and grade level as the new teachers, and principals did all formal evaluations. Two groups of first-year teachers in each district responded to interview questions: beginning teachers with no experience (N=55) and teachers new to the district with at least two years of previous experience (N=43). Findings indicate that the majority of the teachers attributed most of their learning to the induction programs (particularly the mentors and consultants), and new teachers reported that they had learned the most about teaching in their previous first-year experience. A majority of beginning teachers said they derived most help from the evaluations provided by their consultants and mentors; the role of the principal was diminished in both programs. Follow-up, i.e., feedback and discussion, was viewed by all as more instructive than the evaluations themselves. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED322126

First Year Teachers and the Evaluation Process

Barbara McGregor Moore
Poway Unified School District/San Diego State University
5868 Antigua Blvd.
San Diego, California 92124

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
April, 1990
Boston, MA.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B Moore

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP032 317

This study investigated the effects of induction and evaluation practices on first year teachers' learning and satisfaction. The objectives were to discover what specific methods of induction and evaluation help beginning teachers to learn more about teaching and how this influenced satisfaction with their work.

Three research questions were addressed.

1. How did first year teachers describe the sources of "learning" they experienced during their induction?
2. How did they rate the evaluation process as a contribution to that learning?
3. How did learning to teach influence their satisfaction?

Learning to Teach

While a certain segment of the public persists in the belief that "anyone can be a teacher," others insist that teachers are not "made", but born with "natural" talents. Even teacher educators insist that their students cannot "learn" to teach during the short duration of student teaching. Veteran teachers quite often acknowledge that teaching demands life long learning, and many school districts engage in extensive staff development to encourage this approach.

Educational researchers have given us some insight to the process. Feiman-Nemser (1983) describes four stages of learning to teach and their limitations. First, teachers learn by going to school. They are influenced by former teachers, but their observations are not based on a pedagogical framework. While they can imitate the teacher's actions, they seldom understand the underlying intellectual processes involved in teaching. Thus, future teachers enter the field of education with prior knowledge that encourages them to look for "recipes".

Second, teachers expect to learn from first hand experience. Student teaching too often maintains the status quo and encourages conformity, so student teachers take on a utilitarian attitude concerned with management and technique instead of understanding the principles of learning.

Third, the induction year where the beginning teacher is fully responsible for a classroom of students provides reality shock, and they try to survive through a process of trial and error. The last stage in learning to teach takes place over the years, sometimes through district inservice. However, this often provides little connection to classroom problems and seldom has enough follow up to make it effective (Feiman-Nemser, 1983).

Recent studies have reported that a definite knowledge base of teaching and reflective analysis of teaching performance are necessary for learning to teach. Both theoretical and practical knowledge about teaching and learning is complex, since they come from a variety of disciplines and depend on continually changing contexts. Nevertheless, this knowledge enables teachers to make professional judgments about how and when to act in order to affect student learning. This is not learned without examining prior beliefs, but is acquired through a step by step process of inquiry that continues throughout a teaching career.

Teachers have described "direct experience in the classroom, my own study and interactions and observations of colleagues" as the most effective sources of learning about teaching (Smylie, 1989). However, it is noted that teachers are so absorbed in their work that they have little perspective on what is happening in their classrooms, and that they seldom have opportunities to learn and improve with their busy schedules.

Hollingsworth (1989) suggests that pedagogical routines, such as organizing and managing the classroom must be accompanied by a comprehensive understanding of theories of knowledge acquisition and the social nature of learning. They must know how to "merge knowledge of human learning, subject, and pedagogy into specific academic tasks" (Hollingsworth, 1989:163). This is accomplished through a cognitive process of ongoing self analysis and questioning involving experimentation which often challenges prior beliefs and conservative school models. This process also takes time and a supportive work environment.

The experiences of being a student, the student teaching experience and the ongoing local inservice efforts all contribute to learning how to teach. This paper focuses on the bridge from university training to district training: the first year teacher. It particularly investigates the effects of induction support and teacher evaluation processes.

Teacher Induction

It has become commonly accepted that induction programs can influence the kind of teacher a person becomes during the first year. Even though teachers rate student teaching as the most valuable part of teacher education, the first year of total responsibility for a classroom is often where "real" learning takes place.

First year teachers encounter problems with classroom management, organization, motivation of students at the same time they are trying to figure out where to find supplies and how to fit into their new environment. This leaves little time for

reflective analysis or actual cognitive study of the act of teaching and its effect on student learning.

More than providing emotional support, induction programs can focus on helping first year teachers learn from classroom experience. Most teachers who have no formal induction program are left to sink or swim and use the "trial and error" method of learning to teach. This often results in "survival" techniques instead of pedagogical effectiveness (Johnson & Ryan, 1983).

Many studies report that the help of a support teacher during the first year is the best intervention (Huling-Austin, 1988). In addition to providing curricular advice and site information, support teachers can help teachers learn about classroom management and instructional strategies. Many new teachers report that observation of other teachers and time to talk with them are important, and induction programs usually try to provide opportunities for this sort of interaction.

Additionally, a support teacher who teaches the same grade level and is located at the same site was described as most practical. Those who provided detailed feedback on classroom instruction were described as the most helpful (Wildman, Niles, Magliaro, McLaughlin & Drill, 1987).

The goals of induction programs vary from state to state and district to district, but nearly all try to improve teaching performance and promote a sense of efficacy at the same time. Others are merely set up to satisfy mandated requirements and actually provide little assistance. If the veteran teachers do not have time to carry out support duties, an induction program may consist of district meetings and inservice workshops where questions are answered and services are offerred. A few districts offer both assistance and peer evaluation in the induction program.

Teacher Evaluation

In addition to many helpful induction practices, teacher evaluation holds promise for learning about teaching. The process of observations and feedback can help first year teachers to identify and analyze problems, as well as providing reassurance to teachers that they are doing a good job.

Beginning teachers are most frequently the ones who need the most careful assessment, not only to assure them of their competence, but to also offer helpful suggestions for improvement. However, studies also caution against mixing assistance and evaluation (Brooks, 1987).

"The use of teacher evaluation for improvement of teaching practices is widely

intended but rarely applied." (Buttram & Wilson, 1987:49). Teachers have long reported that evaluations are stressful, but that they make very little difference in their instruction. Administrative evaluations have often been viewed as perfunctory, bureaucratic and meaningless (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1986; Wise, Darling-Hammond, McLaughlin & Bernstein, 1984). Quite often teachers' work is merely inspected, and many of the complex teaching skills are hard to measure.

Some researchers have supported the use of peers to set professional standards and monitor competent practice (Wise, et al, 1984: Pfeifer, 1987). Peers can often provide more time and expertise than administrators and are less prescriptive and bureaucratic. However, some teachers are fearful of "politics", role conflicts and legal issues.

Teachers have reported that one of the least effective sources of learning to teach is formal administrative evaluation (Smylie, 1989). They also noted that evaluations which make them aware of problems they had not seen are only helpful if suggestions for solutions are offered, but often these suggestions result in quick fix remedies, instead of forcing the teacher to analyze and improve in a professional manner. Unless the evaluation process is tied into staff development of an ongoing nature, little teacher learning is likely to take place.

Incorporating learning to teach into the evaluation process takes extraordinary expertise, tact and an inordinate amount of time. To be worthwhile, teacher evaluation must be conducted in a relationship where there is rapport and respect, good communication and a focus on teaching performance (McLaughlin & Pfeifer, 1988).

Teacher Satisfaction

Since attraction and retention of talented teachers has become a national priority, more attention has been directed toward teachers' work satisfaction (Carnegie, 1986; Holmes, 1986). People are attracted to teaching for two main reasons: meaningful and worthwhile work and interpersonal interactions.

Teachers are often motivated by a service ideal. They feel rewarded by opportunities to influence others, making a valuable contribution to society and having a sense of purpose and dedication. Many teachers also declare that they went into teaching because they like people and want to work closely with them, especially students. They continue to judge their satisfaction based on their students' progress and relationships with coworkers (Moore, 1986).

Teachers decide to leave the classroom, when dissatisfactions outweigh the

rewards of meaningful work and pleasant interpersonal interactions. For most teachers, dissatisfaction comes from a lack of status and power. Teachers see that their work is not held in high esteem. They presumed that providing a worthwhile and valuable service made teaching a respected profession and resent the fact that they are not respected. Since they view their work as commendable, they not only want respect, but they also look for appreciation and recognition.

Power concerned authority, autonomy, control and influence. Teachers placed a high priority on having authority over how they do their work and wanted more influence on policies. They acknowledged the control they experienced in their classrooms, but found little autonomy outside those classroom walls. When not involved in administrative decisions, their satisfaction decreases because they feel powerless (Moore, 1986).

Teachers, probably more than any other group of workers, value learning. Learning to be an effective teacher contributes greatly to teachers' sense of efficacy and accomplishment and increases satisfaction. Since they judge themselves by the accomplishment of their students, any learning that enables them to directly affect their students is a source of satisfaction as well. They want to see a connection between any induction, inservice or evaluation practices and their own classrooms, and they are impatient with anything they can't immediately apply to their students.

Teachers judge satisfaction on an emotional and intuitive level. When they solve a discipline problem, find a new curricular idea or master a classroom routine, they are encouraged to continue to teach. Any practice that increases teachers' learning about helping students also increases their satisfaction with teaching and their desire to stay in the classroom.

Methods

In order to discover what aspects of induction programs and what types of evaluation influenced teachers' learning and satisfaction, two different induction and evaluation methods were investigated.

One district had an induction program which used teachers as full time consultants to provide assistance and conduct formal evaluations for the first year teachers. These teacher consultants used a clinical supervision format for both formal and informal observations of teaching performance. The emphasis was on the retention of promising new teachers, but also addressed "weeding out" incompetents. There was a delicate balance between encouraging on the one hand and criticizing on the other. While many new teachers were somewhat threatened by this arrangement, once they met the

consultants, they felt relieved.

Consultants and Peer Evaluation: The district program consisted of a one day orientation meeting conducted and financed by both the district office and the local teachers' federation. In addition to orientation information concerning resources, materials, supplies and services, teachers had the opportunity to meet in small groups with grade level representatives. This allowed them to interact and ask specific questions. Most first year teachers rated these sessions as the most beneficial part of the day.

When they arrived at the school sites there was no formal induction. Some principals met individually with the new teachers and gave them a tour of the school, but other beginning teachers entered a first day faculty meeting along with other returning teachers. They were hesitant to ask questions or seek information under these circumstances.

The first real classroom assistance came from the consultants. These were four teachers on special assignment whose only duties were to assist and evaluate 60 first year teachers throughout the year. They visited the new teachers the week before school started and helped them get their rooms ready, order supplies, find materials, set up attendance and grading procedures and answer questions. From then on the consultants visited on a weekly basis, bringing new materials and ideas, observing and offering feedback and suggesting workshops, conferences and inservices when appropriate. Formal evaluations were conducted once each semester and consisted of a preconference, observation and post conference cycle. During both formal and informal evaluations, first year teachers were encouraged to analyze the effects of their instruction on student learning and to reflect on how both classroom management and lesson delivery influence student behavior and achievement.

The second district provided an informal and voluntary program of assistance using "mentor-buddies" at the same school and grade level as the new teachers, and principals did all formal evaluations. These principals also used a form of clinical supervision, but in varying degrees.

Mentors and Administrative evaluation: In this district, first year teachers were welcomed to the school sites by their mentors during the week before school began. Each mentor was assigned to only one first year teacher. The mentor gave a tour of the school explaining specific procedures for supplies, materials, discipline policies, attendance forms, and lunch and recess procedures. Then they drove the first year

teacher through the neighborhood and described demographics, parental attitudes and district priorities. During this personalized attention, new teachers had opportunities to ask questions, discuss concerns and establish a bond with the mentor. The mentors explained that they would be available for any assistance the new teacher wanted and would like to set up a meeting time once a week just to talk and share materials. The mentors were usually team leaders of their grade level also and met with all members of the team once a week.

There was no district orientation, and site administrators only met informally with the new teachers. The mentors were busy setting up their own rooms, so could provide limited assistance to the newcomers at the beginning. Nevertheless, most of them established warm, supportive relationships right away, and the mentors were available for brief consultations at nearly any time of the day. Sometimes the mentors and new teachers would trade classes for a certain subject and then discuss differences. The major constraint was that they had no opportunities to watch each other.

Principals conducted one formal evaluation each semester. They met with the first year teachers, discussed goals, observed and discussed their observations each time. Most principals also did "pop in" informal observations but did no follow up and sometimes no discussion.

In both districts, semi-structured interviews were conducted with first year teachers during the fall and spring of the 1988-1989 school year. Only spring results are reported in this paper. Questions were open-ended, giving respondents a chance to describe their answers in detail. Subjects were encouraged to expand on their answers, and these answers were further investigated by careful probing using Rogerian counseling techniques. The interviews were also designed to allow for unsolicited responses.

Two groups of first year teachers in each district responded to interview questions: beginning teachers (BTs - no experience), and new teachers (NTs - new to the districts with at least two years of previous experience). This resulted in the following groups and a 78% response rate:

	Peer Eval	Admin Eval	Total
BTs	25	30	55
NTs	19	24	43
Total	44	54	98

Responses were subjected to content analysis, where common topics were defined, and frequency distributions were constructed using recurring themes (Glaser & Strauss,

1967; Spradley, 1979).

Results

Four main topics were explored in the interviews: 1) Sources of learning to teach, 2) Induction practices, 3) Evaluation practices and 4) Satisfaction with teaching.

First, the teachers were asked to describe the experiences that were most helpful in learning to teach. This resulted in the following categories: help from the mentor or consultant, other teachers, inservice, administrators, previous experience and student teaching.

	Mentor Consultant		OtherTs		Inservice		Adm		Exper		STing	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
BTP	21	84	3	12	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
NTP	5	26	0	0	5	26	2	11	7	37	0	0
BTA	20	67	7	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	10
NTA	4	17	1	4	0	0	5	20	14	58	0	0

BTP - Beginning teacher in the peer evaluation program
NTP - New teacher in the peer evaluation program
BTA - Beginning teacher in the administrative evaluation program
NTA - New teacher in the administrative evaluation program

Findings indicated that the majority of beginning teachers attributed most of their learning to the induction program (particularly the mentors and consultants), and new teachers found that they had learned the most about teaching in their previous "first year" experience. They all had different ideas about what "learning" entailed. For many, it was simply gaining information (like locating supplies), but for others it was seen as a problem solving process.

A large majority (84%) of the beginning teachers in the peer consultant program attributed their sources of learning to teach to their consultants. A typical response was "She's there every week. I can save up all my questions, and then show her in class because she stays and watches how the kids respond. I learned how to ignore some interruptions and stop everything for others. She showed me how I could keep on going when Peter got up and walked around, and how I had to stop and make an issue when someone was name calling. She helped me make better judgments about the seriousness of offenses."

A majority (67%) of the beginning teachers in the second district also cited their mentors as helping them learn. They described more information about school procedures than instructional performance. "Just having a chance to talk and ask dumb questions helped me learn about things like keeping kids in at recess and how to figure out the report card." Other comments described the mentors as giving "permission" to experiment. "I'd always ask

her what she would do and then I'd go ahead. I liked getting confirmation that I was doing the right thing."

Another reported, "My mentor was terrific. I talked to her every day and she spent hours giving me materials and advice on everything from evaluations to lice. She gave me the school handbook and went through every little thing. She color coded a grade book for me so I could keep track of which student owed me what assignments."

New teachers in both districts found their previous experience was their greatest source of learning, but many continued to learn from the induction program as well. "I found out what you could and could not do in my first job, but I'm discovering that everything is just a little different between districts, schools and grade levels, so I'm still learning."

Other new teachers did not find the induction program appealing. "This mentor business is a bother. I've already taught four years in — and don't need or want to have to sit down and talk with her. There just isn't time. She doesn't force it but always lets me know she's available like implying that I should. However, she was very helpful at the beginning when she showed me around the school and let me know how things work. I don't think experienced teachers like myself should have these mentors, concentrate on the brand new teachers. Don't treat me like a new teacher."

The teachers were asked what part of the induction program was most helpful in learning about instructional performance.

	BTP		NTP		BTA		NTA	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Before School	0	0	0	0	10	33	14	58
Talk Instruction	8	32	3	16	5	17	0	0
Demo Lessons	5	20	2	11	0	0	0	0
Observe Other Ts	5	20	2	11	0	0	0	0
Talk Support	0	0	0	0	9	30	0	0
Materials	2	8	5	26	6	20	10	42
Workshops	5	20	7	37	0	0	0	0

More teachers in the mentor program found before school meetings with their mentors to be most helpful. One described this as follows: "If you know what other teachers have experienced with certain children, it saves you from trying to reinvent the wheel. My mentor knew a lot about my class. She'd had brothers or sisters and knew about the families. When you know you can't expect any help from home, you just sit down and figure out a deal between you and the student. This was valuable information, and so was the ride around the neighborhood. It makes you put things in perspective." Another said, "She really helped me get organized, gave me lots of materials, helped me order supplies,

explained the referral system, discipline policy and all that, so I could concentrate on getting the classroom set up and planning lessons."

Beginning teachers in the mentor program also learned from emotional support. They explained that they felt they could try new strategies when the mentor told them, "You're doing fine" or "Don't worry". Nevertheless, a few new teachers felt the mentors discoraged new methods. "She and the other grade level team members want us all to do just about the same things and pretty much at the same time."

Teachers in the consultant program appreciated chances to watch other teachers and demonstration lessons. One teacher described her consultant: "She showed me first of all how to get the kids to follow directions. I had been saying it once and asking if they understood. She asked me to think about a different approach and try some different tactics. Then I would say it twice and get one or two of the kids to say it back to me and wait a lot in between. You can't believe what a difference it made. One of the best things was that she always made me really examine how what I did affected what the students learned. She would have me write down other things I could have done and then we'd talk about them. Sometimes it kept me up nights but in the long run it made me feel kinda like a doctor looking for a cure."

These teachers also learned from district workshops and talking about instructional practices with the consultants. Most of them wanted practical information that they could apply directly to their own classrooms. One new teacher reported, "I really love the make it - take it workshops. You feel it's worth the time when you can take some new activity back to the students the next morning. I didn't like those that just asked you to think about concepts of math for example." These teachers were more likely to turn to other first year teachers for emotional support.

The mentor program provided extensive orientation before school began and did not have opportunities for observing other teachers, demonstration lessons or workshops. The consultant program provided less school site orientation before school began. In both programs, the first year teachers were given materials by the support teachers and had opportunities for talking with them.

Next the teachers were asked to describe how they were evaluated and how they rated the experience as far as a contribution to their learning to teach. Formal evaluations in both districts were conducted twice a year. All were based on a clinical supervision model, but administrators often skipped either the pre or post conference due to lack of time. Consultants also did many informal evaluations, but the administrators did very few. Even

when administrators popped in, they did not provide feedback. In the administrative model there were no unsatisfactory evaluations, but four teachers were rated unsatisfactory by the consultants.

First year teachers rated the contribution of their evaluations on learning to teach as follows:

	Damaging		Not Helpful		Helpful		Very Helpful	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
BTP	2	8	0	0	2	8	21	84
NTP	1	5	0	0	10	53	8	42
BTA	0	0	22	73	8	27	0	0
NTA	0	0	19	79	4	17	1	4

While the majority of teachers in the consultant program rated their evaluations as helpful or very helpful in learning, administrative evaluations were seen as not helpful by the majority in that program. This may be because of the amount of time spent on the process and going through many informal evaulations first in the consultant program. Consultants and mentors were able to establish personal relationships with the first year teachers, but some administrators did not really know them at all. Nevertheless, none of the administrative evaluations were seen as damaging. Those who described peer evaluations as damaging to their learning explained, "It kept me from trying what I thought was better. It was too rigid."

Typical comments ran as follows:

Beginning teacher, consultant program - "These evaluations were good for me because she kept track of student responses that I was unaware of. She helped me develop eyes in the back of my head, how to scan corners and pockets of the room and to wait until I had them all ready."

Some of the consultants were very prescriptive, but the beginning teachers wanted "recipes" and said it made them more comfortable. "At first, my consultant took me by the hand and led me step by step. She was always there for me and I called her a lot. Then on evaluations she always told me just what to do so it was pretty easy. I learned things like how many kids I didn't call on, how to pass out materials so they didn't fight or have to wait. You should have seen the day I gave them drumsticks! But she just demonstrated how to give instructions first and the next time I did what she said, and it was great."

New teacher, consultant program - "She wrote down everything I said. I found that after I gave directions, I kept adding qualifiers and restating so much that the students knew they didn't have to listen in the first place. I learned to shut up and make them help

each other."

Another teacher was not positive. "From what they said at the beginning I thought OK they are going to give me all the help I need to be a good teacher. Now I think the consultants are there just to make sure you fit the mold. They want certain behaviors (like a 5 step lesson and assertive discipline) without considering my personality or philosophy or the kinds of students I have. I got negative evaluations because of technical and mechanical things."

Beginning teacher, administrative program - "The principal told me I'd better learn how to pass out papers so I stopped letting the students help me. I had thought it was positive for them but he didn't like it. Of course, they did goof off, but I used it as a reward. I'm not sure he understood why I did it."

"I was really nervous about having the principal observe but Helen told me "just ignore him. No one takes him seriously, and his evaluations are always good anyway so don't get all worked up".

New teacher, administrative program - "It was demoralizing because I never knew whether he thought I was doing a good job or not. Now and then I'd think he's just trying to be nice because he didn't criticize, but I wondered if I was doing something wrong. Then I finally got the paper, and he said I was going a great job! Why didn't he tell me?"

"The principal is very nice. She doesn't know anything about me or the class, but she can see I know how to give a lesson, and she was complimentary on my evaluations."

There were two main diffferences between peer and administrative evaluations. First, consultants had established weekly contacts with the teachers and second, they did extensive post conferencing, often with follow up by inservice, video tapes or lengthy discussions. The administrators seldom had time to do any follow up except for short "pep talks".

When comparing the first year teachers according to peer or administrative evaluations, the beginning teachers found their evaluations by peers to be more helpful than the new teachers did. New teachers generally thought evaluation was an administrative function and found it difficult to place as much importance on evaluations done by peers.

The final area of investigation was teacher satisfaction. First teachers were asked to rate their satisfaction with teaching so far, and then reasons for satisfaction and dissatisfaction were explored.

	VeryDis		Dis		Somewhat		Sat		VerySat	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
BTP	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	93
NTP	2	11	1	5	0	0	10	53	6	32
BTA	3	10	4	13	0	0	3	10	20	67
NTA	2	8	2	10	2	10	11	46	7	29

The majority of all teachers in both programs were satisfied with teaching, but beginning teachers expressed more satisfaction than new teachers. In the consultant model, the beginning teachers were either very dissatisfied or very satisfied.

Most teachers found working with students to be the most rewarding part of their work. They also attributed their satisfaction to consultants and learning in that order. However, it is difficult to explain the difference between actual learning and a sense of accomplishment or efficacy. When these teachers felt they were reaching their students or that others thought they were doing a good job, they pointed to their learning. One teacher reported, "I really enjoy the preparation. Getting everything organized, and greeting the children. That's my favorite part of the day. They come in in the morning and I think about everything I want to do. It doesn't always turn out the way I'd imagined, but every time I go back to the drawing board and work on different approaches for different pupils. I'm very optimistic. I've learned so much this year, and I've actually seen some wonderful reactions that I didn't expect. That just makes me more motivated. Even when I find something that doesn't work, I'm anxious to try something new. I think the challenge is satisfying."

Dissatisfaction often resulted from the fact that these teachers were tired. They reported the lack of time to do a good job as their greatest frustration. "I get very disappointed at times. I can't do everything I'd like to. I've had lots of help and encouragement, but I'd say half my class hasn't learned anything. Just this week, only three students had 100% on their spelling tests and about a dozen did worse on the posttest than they did on the pretest. If I had time to sit down with each one of them or if their parents would just go over the words with them I think most of them could get 100%. I don't feel I'm doing a good job, but I'm dancing as fast as I can."

Another dissatifying aspect of teaching was the fact that these teachers don't think anyone understands how hard they work. "No one cares. I don't have a chance to eat lunch, go to the bathroom or make a phone call from 7 am to 5 pm. It's just putting out fires and no one knows, let alone appreciates how hard I work. Kids don't do homework, parents don't come to Open House. I worked for two weeks for a nice Open House presentation. I fixed up

the room and put out the best of every student's work. It looked so nice, and I only had seven parents. I went home and cried. I love the students, but I'm very disappointed with teaching."

Even when teachers reported both satisfying and dissatisfying aspects of teaching, some of them saw their careers as promising for personal reasons. One teacher in the consultant program was committed to the district because of a luncheon. "On the first day they took us to that gorgeous hotel and gave us a free banquet, and I tell you, after subsisting on peanut butter during my year of student teaching I was really impressed. I felt they really wanted me, and they'll never be sorry for hiring me. I'll work my butt off."

Reasons for satisfaction or lack of it were not always clear. Teachers who had more difficult assignments were not always dissatisfied. In fact, they often gave more optimistic descriptions of teaching than those who had it relatively easy. One interesting aspect is that those teachers who had been given explicit guidelines (similar to the recipes that student teachers seem to want) felt more secure and satisfied with their new jobs in the classrooms. For some, reflection and self analysis led to dissatisfaction because they doubted themselves, and evaluations which merely said, "Good job" did not provide adequate feedback. This is partially attributed to personal motivations and attitudes and needs further research.

Conclusions

In general, the findings of this study were positive. The induction programs were helpful, the consultants' evaluations contributed to learning to teach, and even the administrative evaluations were not seen as damaging. The majority of all teachers in both programs were satisfied with teaching.

Learning to teach

Findings indicate that the majority of beginning teachers attributed most of their learning to the induction program (mentors and consultants), and new teachers reported that they had learned the most about teaching in their previous "first year" experience. A few teachers were surprised that they were still expected to be learning and felt they should already have all the answers.

Mentors were most helpful before school started and were best at practical advice and emotional support. They concentrated on organization and planning. They were praised for easing guilt, suggesting classroom management techniques and explaining school site discipline policies. Consultants were most helpful when providing opportunities to watch

other teachers, giving demonstration lessons and when talking about instruction. They also helped first year teachers shorten planning and preparation time.

The mentors socialized with the first year teachers on a personal basis. At first they just offered information, and then many of them entered into problem solving over a pizza or glass of wine. First year teachers reported that this made it possible to share failures or inadequacies without fear. The consultants seldom saw their teachers informally, but first year teachers reported that they felt free to talk about anything with them. They did not attribute emotional support to consultants as often.

First year teachers did not have their personal views and beliefs tested unless they had extensive interaction with other teachers. Many first year teachers found they learned most when they got away from teaching by the book - curriculum guides and teacher manuals. They often borrowed ideas and materials from other teachers and reported that learning how to use these in their own classrooms really made them "think".

They appreciated factual information about school procedures and "practical" suggestions for solving classroom problems. New teachers in the consultant program also found "practical" workshops to be most helpful. They valued "answers" and "prescriptions". While prescriptive advice made first year teachers feel comfortable, it didn't force teachers to think, process information, make decisions or use professional judgment. Real learning took place when they tried new things.

Evaluation as a contribution to learning to teach

First year teachers who were evaluated by the consultants found they learned more from their evaluations than those who were evaluated by administrators. This may because of the amount of time spent on the process and the prescriptive advice offered. The teachers sometimes felt that the consultants wanted them to "fit the mold," but the beginners said this helped them learn. Many teachers equated gaining information with learning, and continually wanted the consultants to "just tell me what to do."

The role of the principal was diminished in both programs. In the consultant program, the principal seldom saw the first year teachers, and relegated the responsibility for their induction to the consultants. In the mentor program, the principals did evaluations, but seldom made time for anything else. This made a difference in evaluations because the first year teachers did not feel that the principal really knew them.

Administrative evaluations suffered from lack of time and knowledge of the classroom or the teacher, but they also concentrated on aspects of teaching that did not relate to instruction. First year teachers who were evaluated by administrators reported that they

felt more emphasis was placed on "duties" and attending meetings than on their effectiveness with students in the classroom.

The beginning teachers seemed to value the opinions of other teachers, mentors and consultants more than those of the administrators. One teacher said, "My principal is a nice guy who taught high school P.E. twenty years ago. He has never heard of whole language and doesn't think much of integrated curriculum. I would much rather have another grade level teacher's opinion."

This was definitely not true of the new teachers. They had been evaluated by administrators in their first teaching experience, and many of them stated that they were not comfortable unless they had the principal's "stamp of approval". This did not necessarily mean having principals in classrooms, but a feeling that they knew the teachers were doing a good job.

Follow up was viewed as more instructive than the evaluation itself. This meant coming back and observing again after a discussion of areas of improvement. Whenever first year teachers rated evaluations as a contribution to their learning, they pointed to feedback and discussion. They were not seen as helpful when they were hurried and there was no follow up. They were most helpful when rapport was established and the before and after process was used. Specific expectations, such as what the evaluator is looking for, gave first year teachers a comfort zone. They did not necessarily want simplistic checklists, but specific advice on how to improve. Teachers also wanted a chance to explain why they acted in certain ways. They wanted many informal observations, and a chance to get to know their evaluators in a non-threatening way so they could feel comfortable with them.

Evaluation must be relevant to teacher concerns and offer useful suggestions for improvement. First year teachers need to feel that the purpose of evaluation is to help them, that the evaluator knows something that they value, and that something useful will result from the process.

Satisfaction with teaching

Beginning teachers were most satisfied. First, they enjoyed the personal interaction with students, then felt that learning (whether accomplishment or sense of efficacy) increased their satisfaction. The lack of time to do a good job and lack of appreciation were most dissatisfying.

Beginning teachers were not fully aware of the complexities of teaching. They appreciated simplistic solutions for problems, and their personal expecations did not always match actual experience. In many cases they were more interested in the external appearance

of the classroom activities than in theinternal actual learning which is harder to see. To these teachers and to many evaluators, signs of effective teaching were quiet classrooms, good organization, and smooth transitions. Sometimes they were satisfied if things merely "looked good". Others reported dissatisfaction from this source. One teacher reported this about her evaluation, "He paid more attention to how long it took me to get everyone started than to the fact that I actually got Billy to school every day by letting him warm up without pressure."

Satisfaction was only slightly influenced by evaluations, but induction practices greatly increased satisfaction for the beginners. New teachers reported slightly less satisfaction with their work and were more interested in administrative opinions. Beginning teachers complained less about poor working conditions and extra curricular duties. Being satisfied with the work of teaching was closely related to career plans, commitment and motivation.

Recommendations

Before school begins, districts can help teachers by offering both a district and site level orientation and a tour of the neighborhood. This provides an overview and specific information that influences their many decisions in the classroom. School site administrators should be involved and should try to get to know the teachers, especially if they will be doing evaluations.

Knowing what resources are available on the district level, what policies and procedures are required at the site level and what kind of parental support can be expected is necessary to enable first year teachers to do their best. This before school experience also makes them feel welcome and valued, and it can have a powerful effect on their motivation. When teachers are hired late and miss out on an orientation, their first year is much more difficult.

Mentors (or even buddies) at the same site and grade level are valuable to first year teachers because of daily contact and helping them know what to expect (specific school information, grade cards, procedures, AV materials , special events.)

Consultant assistance is valuable in providing expert knowledge about teaching performance, but this takes a long time. Because of frequent visits, they establish positive relationships that are necessary for trust in evaluations. They also provide opportunities for observations, demonstrations and interactions with other teachers. On a long term basis, they offer instructional advice that is respected.

In order to help first year teachers learn, teacher evaluation must begin with

rapport, concentrate on instructional performance and provide opportunities for follow up, which includes teacher input. Consultant evaluations were highly valued because teachers came to respect their knowledge. If administrative evaluations are used, the principals must be up to date on curriculum and instructional practices, and they must be willing to spend more time to make it a truly collaborative and "learning" experience. Mentors could provide practice evaluations, but consultants who meet with the teachers on a weekly basis offer more time and expertise than most administrators. Additionally, it is important, especially to new teachers, to have official administrative recognition.

Satisfaction with teaching is dependent on more than induction, evaluation or learning about teaching. However, first year teachers felt a greater sense of efficacy when they were "learning". These teachers were influenced by working conditions, extra duties and the type of students they taught, but their own values and attitudes determined how they coped with the first year. Their motivation, commitment and retention depended on a high level of satisfaction, provided more by achievement of personal goals and interactions with students than other factors. Nevertheless, the assistance and recognition they receive from other teachers, parents, and administrators were influential, and the mentors and consultants were important contributions to their satisfaction.

Learning to teach is a long and complex process. When teachers can get beyond the "practical" and basic information about their schools and students, they are more likely to concentrate on how their actions affect student learning. Specific practices that help teachers do more than survive include providing opportunities for more collaboration. Districts that recognize this, must create an environment in which teachers, as well as students have opportunities to learn.

References

Brooks, D. (1987). Teacher induction: A new beginning. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Buttram, J. & Wilson, B. (1987). Promising trends in teacher evaluation. Educational Leadership, 44 (7), 4-6.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Carnegie Forum.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1983). Learning to teach. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory. Hawthorne, New York: Aldine Publishing Co.

Hollingsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. American Educational Research Journal, 26 (2), 160-189.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group Inc.

Huling-Austin, L. (1988). A synthesis of research on teacher induction programs and practices. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Johnston, J. & Ryan, K. (1983). Research on the beginning teacher: Implications for teacher education. In K. Howey & W. Gardner (Eds.) The education of teachers: A look ahead. New York: Longman.

McLaughlin, M. & Pfeifer, S. (1988). Teacher evaluation. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. & Pfeifer, S. (1986). Teacher evaluation: Learning for improvement and accountability. Stanford, CA: Center for Educational Research at Stanford.

Moore, B. (1986). Satisfaction with teaching as a job and as a career. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Claremont Graduate School and San Diego State University.

Pfeifer, S. (1987). Variations on a theme: An analysis of peer involvement in teacher evaluation. Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association, Annual Meeting. Washington, D.C.

Smylie, M. (1989). Teachers' views of the effectiveness of sources of learning to teach. Elementary School Journal. (89 (5), 543-558.

Spradley, J. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wildman, T., Niles, J., Magliaro, S., McLaughlin, R., & Drill, L. (1987). Virginia's colleague teacher project: Focus on beginning teachers' adaptation to teaching. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D. C.

Wise, A., Darling-Hammond, L, McLaughlin, M., & Bernstein, H. (1984). Teacher evaluation: A study of effective practices. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.